



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/810,396	03/25/2004	Patrick D. Perkins	10010466-3	8981
22878	7590	05/04/2005	EXAMINER	
AGILENT TECHNOLOGIES, INC. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION, LEGAL DEPT. P.O. BOX 7599 M/S DL429 LOVELAND, CO 80537-0599			NGUYEN, KIET TUAN	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2881		
DATE MAILED: 05/04/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/810,396	PERKINS, PATRICK D.
	Examiner Kiet T. Nguyen	Art Unit 2881

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 March 2005.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,2,4-9,13,15,17 and 19 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,2,4-9,13,15,17 and 19 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some \* c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- Other: \_\_\_\_\_

***Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 112, First Paragraph***

Claims 1-2, 4-9, 13, 15, 17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Applicant is only claiming a single means, i.e. an ionization chamber, and not a combination of elements.

***Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2, 4-9, 13, 15 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mantkowski (5,075,966).

Mantkowski (5,075,966) discloses, in figs. 1A-4B, a rocket engine having a tubular combustion chamber 28 that can be made of a substrate with a surface layer forming the chamber therein. The substrate 10 can be super alloy such as Inconel 625, as well as, the layer 18 (see col. 4, lines 19-23 and col. 5, lines 15-18).

It is obvious to one skilled in the art that the combustion chamber in a rocket engine would produce a certain amount of ions from the ignition of the gas therein; and therefore the rocket engine can broadly be considered as an ionization chamber. Further, it is obvious that the thickness of the super alloy layer can be determined by

anyone of ordinary skill in the art, depending upon the intended purpose of the ion source.

Applicant's arguments filed on 09 March 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argued that the rejected claims 1-2, 4-9, 13, 15, 17 and 19 recite an ionization chamber not the word "means", thereby these claims are not single means claims; and Mantkowski (5075966) discloses a rocket engine not an ionization chamber for a mass spectrometer.

This argument is not persuasive. The recitation that "an ionization chamber for a mass spectrometer" in preamble has not been given patentable weight because it has been held that a preamble is denied the effect of a limitation where the claim following the preamble is a self-contained description of the structure not depending for completeness upon the introductory clause, see "Kropa v. Robie, 88 USPQ 478 (CCPA 1951)".

The body of the rejected claims 1-2, 4-9, 13, 15, 17 and 19 recite the limitation "the ionization chamber comprising an inert super alloy". This limitation is considered to be a single means or a single element because it does not recite how is the ionization chamber comprising an inert super alloy operated to produce ions and how are the ions are measured by the mass spectrometer? Therefore, the rocket engine as disclosed in the Mantkowski (5075966) would produce a certain amount of ions from the ignition of the gas therein, thereby it is considered as an ionization chamber.

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kiet T. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-2479. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8-6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John R Lee can be reached on 571-272-2477. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KN



KIET T. NGUYEN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER